

REMARKS

In response to the restriction requirement imposed by the Examiner, Applicants elect, with traverse, to prosecute Species 1, *i.e.*, claims 1-7 and 12.

After substantial amount of prosecution, the Office has belatedly imposed a restriction requirement. Due to the various office actions and corresponding responses that took place during the prosecution of this patent application, the Office has shown that prosecuting all of the claims (*i.e.*, claims 1-20) of the present invention are indeed, not overly burdensome upon the Office. This is evidenced by the several Office Actions that the Office has issued without previously restricting the claims. The fact that the Examiner in charge of the present patent application has changed is of no moment since the Office has illustrated clearly that it is not overly burdensome upon the Office to prosecute all of the claims of the present invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims of the present invention be prosecuted together.

Further, the Examiner seems to have attempted to map several elements of claims of the present invention to various drawings in order to allege that different drawings correspond to different species. However, the broad claims of the present application are generic to all species. For example, the Examiner mapped claims 1-7 and claim 12 to Figure 6 and asserted that Figures 7 and 9 are of a different species. However, Figure 7 is one embodiment of performing the multi-table I/O space access process described in block 640 of Figure 6. Further, Figure 9 illustrates one embodiment of performing the multi-level table I/O access described in block 740 of Figure 7. However, these are embodiments of performing the multi-table I/O space described in Figure 6, which is the generic subject matter claims. Therefore, claims 8-11 and 17-20 (Species 2 claims) should also be prosecuted along with Species 1 claims.

Further, Species 3 (claims 13-16), which the Examiner asserted relates to Figure 3, should also be prosecuted alongside the remaining claims of the present invention because claims 13-16 call for an apparatus that includes a processor and an I/O access interface. The I/O access interface is adapted to provide a multi-level table I/O space access that is described in Figure 6, which the Examiner contends is Species 1. These arguments, compounded by the fact that the Office has not previously found it burdensome to prosecute all of the pending claims, during a long span of office action, all pending claims should be prosecuted together.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (713) 934-4069 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: August 27, 2007

By: /Jaison C. John/
Jaison C. John, Reg. No. 50,737
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-4069
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)